



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

But I shall take another occasion to discuss the principles of Pindaric composition. The true plan is not to take a concordance and look out recurrent words. The true plan is to work patiently and lovingly after the poet himself. The historical interpretation, as everybody can see, has been overdone. Perhaps it is impossible to understand the poet as well without the historical lore that has been gathered about the odes since the time of Boeckh, but it is perfectly possible to misunderstand the poet by reason of historical lore. Even Boeckh's clear eye was confused at times by seeing too much, and his friend Dissen has been guilty of many utterly absurd over-interpretations of details, some utterly impossible, utterly unhistorical expositions of entire poems. Nowadays the tendency to emphasize the formal side of Pindaric art is pushed to an extreme that is calculated to narrow rather than widen the circle of Pindar's admirers. If it had not been for his discovery, Professor Mezger might have done much to help forward the good cause. He knows how to make his annotations brief, except when he gets on the theme of the recurrent word; but he has wasted much space in literal translations of expressions that translate themselves, and not satisfied with his own renderings, he reproduces many of Fennell's in the original English, as if that helped the matter much. I open the book at random and find the following notes on one page, 199, Py. XII, 10 foll.: *δυσπενθέϊ σὺν καμάρῳ* "bei der leidvollen Qual": v. 11 *τρίτον ἀνυσσεν κασιγνητῶν μέρος*: "er machte dem dritten Theil der Schwestern den Garaus"—which to my perception of German is about equivalent in this connexion to: he did the job for the third part of the sisters, v. 12 *μοῖραν ἄγων*: den Tod bringend; v. 14 *λυπρόν—θήκε*: in Trauer verwandelte er dem Polydektes den Mahlesbeitrag; v. 19 *πάμφωνον*: vollklingend; v. 21 *χυμφθέντα*: hervorgestossen—*σὺν ἔντεσι*: mit den Instrumenten; v. 23 *κεφαλᾶν πολλᾶν νόμον*: die vielköpfige Weise. This kind of annotation reminds an American of the Saturnian reign of Dr. Anthon.

B. L. G.

WORKS OF SPYRIDON A. LAMBROS.

1. Αἱ Ἀθῆναι περὶ τὰ τέλη τοῦ δωδεκάτου αἰῶνος κατὰ πηγὰς ἀνεκδότους. Διατριβὴ ἐπὶ ὑφηγεσίᾳ τοῦ μαθήματος τῆς Ἑλλ' Ἱστορίας ἐν τῇ Ἑθνικῇ Πανεπιστημίῳ, ὑπο Σπυρ. Π. Λάμπρον, Δ. Φ. Ἀθήνησι, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφίᾳ τῆς Φιλοκαλίας 1878. 8 vo. pp. viii, 141.

2. Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ Σωζόμενα, τὰ πλεῖστα ἐκδοδόμενα νῦν τὸ πρῶτον κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ, Ὁξωνίῳ, Παρισίοις, Βιέννῃ κώδικας. Δαπάνη τοῦ δήμου Ἀθηναίων, ὑπὸ Σπυρίδωνος Π. Λάμπρον, Δ. Φ., ὑφηγ. τῆς Ἑλλ' Ἱστορίας καὶ γραφογνωσίας ἐν τῇ Ἑθνικῇ Πανεπιστημίῳ. Τόμος Α', περιέχων τὰς ὁμιλίας καὶ τὰ προσφωνήματα. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Παρνασσού, 1879 8 vo. pp. lxxii, 368: Τόμος Β', περιέχων τὰς ἐπιστολὰς καὶ τὰ ποιήματα τοῦ Μιχαὴλ, τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιστολὰς τοῦ Νέων Πατρῶν Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Τορνίκη, Γρηγορίου Ἀντίχου καὶ Γεωργίου Τορνίκη, σημειώσεις ἱστορικὰς καὶ γραμματικὰς καὶ πίνακας, οἷς προσηρτήθησαν καὶ φωτοτυπικὰ πανομοιότυπα τῶν κωδίκων. Ibid. 1880, 8 vo., pp. 660, xxviii.

3. Collection de Romans grecs en langue vulgaire et en vers, publiés pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits de Leyde et d'Oxford, par Spyridon P. Lambros, Docteur-ès-lettres, Professeur agrégé d'Histoire grecque et de Paléo-

graphie à l'Université d'Athènes. Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie., 1880. 8 vo, cxxv. 372, four facsimiles of MSS.

4. Ἐκθεσις Σπυρίδανος Π. Λάμπρον, Δ. Φ., ὑφηγητοῦ πρὸς τὴν Βουλὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων; περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Ὄρος ἀποστολῆς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ θέρος τοῦ 1880. Ἀθήνησιν, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τοῦ Αἰῶνος, 1880, pp. 32.

5. Ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Πανσελήνου, μετὰ μᾶς χρωματογραφίας, ὑπὸ Σπυρ. Π. Λάμπρον, Δ. Φ., ὑφηγητοῦ. Ἀπόσπασμα ἐκ τοῦ Ε' τόμου τοῦ "Παρνασσού." Ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τοῦ Παρνασσού, 1881, pp. 8.

6. Κανανὸς Λάσκαρις καὶ Βασίλειος Βατάτζης, δύο Ἕλληνες περιηγηταὶ τοῦ ΙΕ καὶ ΙΗ αἰῶνος. Ὑπὸ Σπυρ. Π. Λάμπρον, Δ. Φ., ὑφηγητοῦ τοῦ Ἑθνικοῦ Πανεπιστημίου (Ἀπόσπασμα ἐκ τοῦ Ε' τόμου τοῦ Παρνασσού); ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου τοῦ Παρνασσού, 1881, pp. 15.

Classical scholars usually have the feeling that Hellenism paid the debt of nature in the sixth century of our era, and was succeeded by a condition of things so low, dark, and squalid as hardly to deserve more attention than the affairs of Maoris or Apaches, and that what now claims to be Hellenism has nothing more to do with the genuine article than the inhabitants of Massachusetts have with the tribe that once went by that name. Though these are judgments natural enough, and intelligible to any one who knows how small and scanty are the means within the reach of most scholars for studying the history of post-Justinian Hellenism, and though, if we admit a certain, rather narrow, definition of Hellenism they are not entirely false, it is easy to see and understand that those who still take pride in calling themselves Hellenes should reject them and take an entirely different view of the meaning and historical limits of Hellenism. To them, Hellenism, in spite of all the vicissitudes, degradations, miseries and seeming deaths which it has undergone, is still alive, and the fact that it has survived so much is only a proof of its inexhaustible vitality. And from their point of view, the Hellenes are right also. While it is true that the Pagan Hellenic life, that life of art and intellect, of balance between heart and head, which is growing ever more attractive to modern men as they emerge from the moral dyspepsia of mediaevalism into the harmonious *εὐκράσια* of natural life, was dead or dying for centuries before Justinian, and was succeeded by a very inharmonious and unlovely form of what was always "to the Greeks foolishness"; it is likewise true that the Hellenic national feeling, the Hellenic aspiration for freedom, the Hellenic love of letters, the Hellenic tendency toward the ideal, and the Hellenic speech, have never died out, but are even to-day sending forth fresh shoots, which show that there is still much vigor in the old stock. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the modern Hellenes, however uncertain their genealogy, should endeavor to show that Hellenism has had a real, living, uninterrupted existence in all departments of human activity from the days of Justinian to the present, and that with this view they should direct their attention to the literary monuments of the middle age and try to form them into a connected literary history. It must even be admitted that their success in discovering such literary monuments is beyond all expectation. To be sure, they have no Thomas Aquinas or Alexander of Thales writing great thoughts in the old language, and no Dante or Chaucer singing a fresh national feeling into existence in the new; but they have their historians and priests and poets, whose works mirror their times as

truly as those of the men named mirror theirs, and therefore furnish essential material for a history of the long generations of Hellenic captivity. To bring these works before the world, much has been done by foreigners, such as Ellissen, Wagner, Legrand, Deffner, etc.; but the Greeks themselves have done their share, witness the collections of Sathas, Mavrophrydis, etc.

Among the Greeks who have striven or are striving to give body and strength to the national feeling of the modern Hellenes, by making them conscious of an unbroken existence in the long past, the first place belongs to Spyridon P. Lambros, a partial list¹ of whose works relating to the middle age stands at the head of this article.

Mr. Lambros, who is still what may be called a very young man, hardly over thirty, is the son of a well-known Athenian archaeologist. After studying at the university of his native city, he went abroad to France and Germany, and in 1873 took the degree of Ph. D. at the University of Leipzig, the subject of his dissertation being *Tὰ κατὰ τοὺς οἰκιστὰς τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσιν ἀποικιῶν καὶ τὰς αὐτοῖς ἀπονεμομένας τιμὰς καὶ προνομίας* (Leipzig, 1873). Since that time he has travelled much abroad, and copied many MSS. in the libraries of Germany, Austria, England, France, Holland, Italy, and Turkey. He is now assistant professor in the National University of Athens. His inaugural address is printed in the *Ἀθήναιον*, Vol. VII, pp. 1-35 (*Λόγος εἰσιτήριος εἰς τὸ μάθημα τῆς Ἑλ. Ἰστ.*)

Of the above-named works, the first two belong together, inasmuch as the account of Athens in the 12th century (No. 1) is for the most part drawn from the works of Michael Akominatos (No. 2). The picture of Athens in the twelfth century is by no means an inspiring one, or one calculated to cause us much regret for the subsequent downfall of the wretched empire of which the city formed a part. Poverty, degradation, misgovernment, dilapidation, insecurity of life and property, feebleness, servility, these are the features that most forcibly strike us. But Mr. Lambros' work contains many interesting particulars regarding various buildings in Athens, and especially regarding the Parthenon, which was then almost intact, and bore the name of *Ἐκκλησία τῆς Παναγίας τῆς Ἀθηνωπίσεως*. A passage quoted from Michael Akominatos seems to prove that the Parthenon in the twelfth century was lighted from the top, a fact which has some bearing upon the much vexed "hypoethral question."²

Michael Akominatos, whose works fill two bulky volumes, was born about the year 1140 at Chônæ (*Χῶναι*), the ancient Kolossai, in Phrygia. He was the elder brother of the equally famous Nikêtas Akominatos, whom he treated as a son and educated. He went to Constantinople about 1157 and there received instruction from Eustathios, subsequently Bishop of Thessalonika, and favor-

¹ I say partial, because the list does not include his *Παναγιώτου Δοξαρά περὶ Ζωγραφίας, χειρόγραφον τοῦ ΑΨΚΣ* νῦν τὸ πρῶτον ἐκδιδόμενον. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1871, or his pamphlet *Περὶ Κήπων*, works which I have never seen.

² It runs thus: "Οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο ἀλλ' ἡ οἶκος θεοῦ καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ πύλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεῦθεν τὸ ὑπερουράνιον τοῦτο φῶς ἀκοίμητον εἰσερεῖ δένδρ, οὐκ ἀμυανρούμενον ἡμέρας οὐ διακοπτόμενον νυκτὶ, ἄζυλον, ἄνυλον, ἀκραϊφνέστατον, ἀειλαμπές, ἀειφανές ἀβεβήλοις καὶ πιστοῖς ὁμμασι," p. 35, n. This distinction between the immaterial and material light in the Parthenon would have no meaning if the building was lit artificially with lamps.

ably known as the commentator of Homer and Pindar. From this enthusiastic scholar he imbibed a genuine affection for the old Greek poets, especially for Homer, whom, after the Bible, he quotes most frequently in his works. He was made Bishop of Athens about 1182, and from that date till 1220 his history is bound up with that of the unfortunate city of whose miseries he has left us so sad a picture. That it is so sad was certainly no fault of the good bishop, who did manfully what in him lay, by tongue and pen and sword, to rouse his people from their brutish lethargy of vice and ignorance, to interest the imperial government in their favor, and to defend them from hostile attacks. It is hard to imagine anything more pathetic than this enthusiastic, half-pagan Greek bishop, living on the Akropolis, worshipping every day in the Parthenon, and looking down upon once glorious Athens (*λιπαρὰ Ἀθήναι*), now a mere labyrinth of squalor and ruin.¹ It must have been rather the Pagan than the Christian spirit that induced him to gird on his sword and take the field at the head of his flock against Leon Sgouros, who besieged the city in 1203. Michael was partially successful against this native *condottiere*, who could only burn the lower town without being able to enter the Akropolis; but, in the following year, the whole city was taken by the Franks under Bonifacio di Monferrato, and handed over to Othon de la Roche. On this occasion the Parthenon was plundered, the bishop's extensive, painfully collected library scattered,² and the bishop himself compelled to flee. After wandering about for some time in Thebes, Aulis, Thessalonika, Chalkis, Eretria and Karystos, he finally took up his abode at Keos, whence he could still cast loving and longing eyes toward Attika. Old, poor, lonely, and without his books, the brave, exiled bishop spent most of his time in prayer, meditation and letter-writing. He persistently refused all offers of other bishoprics, resolved to die Bishop of Athens. And so he did. From time to time his monotonous life was interrupted by reports of events whose issue promised to reinstate him; but they all proved baseless. The drop that filled the cup of his suffering was the news of the death of his beloved brother Nikêtas. He lived long enough to write the touching *Μονωδία εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ κίρ. Νικήταν τὸν Χωνιάτην*, many passages of which recall to us Carlyle's *Reminiscences*. He died in 1220 at the age of eighty.

As literature, the writings of Michael Akominatos have little or no value. Instead of being written in the living speech in which their author thought and conversed, they are composed in the turgid, flowery, patchwork, the would-be-Attic Greek, of the pedants of Byzantium. Their style is frequently involved and obscure, and new compounds and words are not unfrequent. Mr. Lambros has at the end of his second volume made a collection of these words, whose number amounts to several hundreds. The best of Michael's works are his

¹ When Mr. L. in this connection says: "Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ναυτίλοι διέκρινον παρακάμπτοντες τὸ Σούνιον καὶ μακρόθεν τὴν αἰχμὴν τοῦ δόρατος τῆς Προμάχου," he falls into a very common error, due to misinterpretation of a passage in Pausanias (I, 28, 2). Any one who has ever been at, or sailed round, Cape Sounion, knows that not even the Akropolis is visible from any point near it. Nor does Pausanias say anything to the contrary. He merely says: "Ἡ τοῦ δόρατος αἰχμὴ καὶ ὁ λόφος τοῦ κράνους ἀπὸ Σουνίου προσηλόνουσιν ἔστιν ἤδη σύνοπτα." Mr. L. likewise shares the common error with regard to the Pelasgic wall.

² See a very interesting article by Mr. Lambros on the contents and fate of this library in the *Ἀθήναιον*, τόμος Ε', τεῦχ. ε', pp. 354-67.

letters and the *monody* already referred to. These show him to have been a brave man and a good priest. Some of his other writings, especially his addresses to certain political potentates, exhibit him in a much less favorable light, as time-serving and insincere like other men of his time. His poetry is as sorry doggerel as one could readily find in the works of any rural Heber or Keble. Nay, even the New England Puritan Wigglesworth is hardly inferior to him as a poet. Here are the first four lines of the first poem, entitled *Θεανώ*:

Ἵσυχίης τόδ' ἄθυρμ' ἐμὸν ἥδέ τε λέσχη μακρὰ
 ἀνδρὸς ἀκηδιόωντος ἀήματι νυσταδέντι,
 οὐ μὲν ἄμουνσον πάμπαν ὅλον τὸ ποίημα πέπαικται
 ἀλλ' ἐπιμῖξ τῆς παιδιῆς ἔσθ' ἃ καὶ ἐσπούδασαι.

These are hexameters by an enthusiastic admirer of Homer!

But whatever faults we may find with the Athenian bishop and his works, it is a matter of great moment that these works should be placed in good shape before the student of history, and this Mr. Lambros has done, bringing to the task care, industry, erudition, judgment, and that familiarity with the language of his author which only a Greek can have. The hundred and sixty-eight pages of notes at the end of the second volume are full of curious erudition.

If the writings of Michael Akominatos acquaint us with the last stages of the decay of the Greek empire, the next work, the *Collection de Romans grecs*, introduces us to the first stages of Hellenic regeneration, the popular literature of the awakening people. These romances, four in number, are written in a semi-popular dialect, "*difficile à définir*," as Mr. Lambros says, and in the dreadful 'political verse,' with which the Klephitic ballads have made us so familiar, and in which even at the present day most Greek poetry is written. They are preceded by an excellent introduction, and followed by a very complete glossary, both in French. Their titles are as follows:

1. Τὰ κατὰ Καλλιμάχον καὶ Χρυσορρόην, ἐρωτικὸν δῆγμα.
2. Διήγησις ὥραιωτάτης τοῦ ἀνδρεϊομένου Διγενῆ (in eight books).
3. Διήγησις ἐξαίρετος ἐρωτικῆ καὶ ξένη τοῦ Ἡμπερίου θανμαστοῦ καὶ κόρας Μαρ-
 γαρώνας.
4. Λόγος παρηγορητικὸς περὶ εὐτυχίας καὶ δυστυχίας.

The first is printed from the only MS. of the poem known to exist. This MS., which Mr. Lambros had much difficulty in discovering, was presented, along with many others, by Jos. Scaliger, in 1609, to the University of Leyden, in which it is still preserved. The story is a wonderful one, a kind of cross between *Dornröschen*, the *Arabian Nights*, and the old Greek romance of *Chaireas and Kalirrhoë*. I have not the least doubt that it sprang from the same root as the *Fafnismal* and the *Sigrdrífumal*, recently made so familiar by Jordan's charming *Nibelunge*. The poem is simply a very long ballad, with all the directness and naiveté that characterize that species of composition. It is not without a certain rugged force here and there. Here is a description of a witch in which Hebrew and Greek mythology are mixed up in a charming way:

Ἡ γράυς ἡ κακομήχανος, τὸ σκεῦος τῶν δαιμόνων,
 τῆς ἀστραπῆς ὁ σύντροφος καὶ τῆς βροντῆς ἡ μάνα,
 τοῦ Σατανᾶ τὸ παίδενμα, τῶν Νηρηίδων μᾶμμη,
 πάσης ἀπλῶς κακωτικῆς πράξεως συνοδίτις.

Some of the descriptions of enchanted places recall passages in Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*. The date of the composition of this poem is not very clear. Mr. Lambros is inclined to place it some half century before the time of the chivalrous Michael Komnenos, that is, about 1100.

The second poem, which runs to 127 pages, is a Greek *Chanson de Roland*, and exists in about as many forms. In 1876 an edition of it was published by Sathas and Legrand, from the so-called Trebizond MS., which was at that time supposed to be the only one in existence. Indeed, the poem was at that time regarded as the only example of a mediaeval metrical romance in Greek. Since then there have come to light, not only numerous other romances of a similar kind, but also numerous MSS. of this one. The author of a version discovered in the island of Andros calls himself Eustathios. The version here published by Mr. Lambros is that of a Chian monk of the name of Ignatius Petritzis, who put the last touches to his work in 1670, and whose autograph MS. was brought from Greece by the traveller Wheler toward the end of the seventeenth century, and is now in the library of Lincoln College, Oxford. This version differs very considerably from the others, and is in several ways an improvement upon them all. The language, which is almost purely Romaic, shows strong traces of the dialect of Chios. When the legend of Digenis originated, or what historical foundation it has, is by no means clear, but it seems to have occupied in the Eastern Empire the same place that the legends of Arthur and Charlemagne did in the West.

The third poem, fifty pages long, is an imitation of the well-known Provençal romance *Pierre de Provence et la belle Marguelonne*, and was published by Wagner in 1874 from a Vienna MS. This edition was so incorrect that Mr. Lambros has done well to recollate the MS., as he has done, making use also of another at Oxford and one at Naples.

The fourth poem is a kind of allegory, a *Pilgrim's Progress*, standing in no very distant connection with the *Pinax* of Kebès. It occupies thirty-three pages, and is not destitute of poetic merit.

All these poems belong to an extensive literature, the very existence of which was unknown a few years ago, but which, when rendered accessible, will, no doubt, be as popular and interesting as the romance literature of the western nations. We will conclude this notice by saying that the volume in which they are contained is a very handsome one.

No. 4 is an account of a visit of research which Mr. Lambros made to the monasteries of Mt. Athos in the summer of 1880. Since Tischendorf made such valuable discoveries in the monasteries of the East, there has been a strong feeling abroad that these monasteries, and especially the great collection of them on Mt. Athos, must contain literary treasures. Mr. Lambros' researches hardly go to confirm this belief. New things of value he certainly did find, but they relate rather to mediaeval than to classical times. He intends to publish shortly a detailed account of his discoveries.

While at Mt. Athos, Mr. Lambros took the opportunity of studying the mediaeval paintings which decorate the churches of the various monasteries, and found some of them far superior to anything usually recognized as Byzantine art. He was particularly struck with the frescoes of a certain Panselinos (Πανσέληνος), whose name has long been familiar, but of whose date and history

nothing is known. A French painter, who accompanied Mr. Lambros, succeeded in making copies of a good many of these frescoes, as well as of numerous miniatures, capital letters, etc., and these he intends shortly to publish. No. 5 gives an account of one of Panselinos's frescoes, and is accompanied with a good chromo-lithograph representing the infant Jesus. This infant, if they were not warned by the presence of the cross, most people would certainly take for Heraklê. It is the infant that developed into the Christ of Michael Angelo's *Last Judgment*. If this be a fair specimen of good Byzantine art, Mr. Lambros is certainly justified in claiming for that art more consideration than has hitherto been accorded to it. It would be interesting to know to what extent the early Italian painters were influenced by the works of the now forgotten Byzantine masters.

The subject of No. 6 is sufficiently indicated by its title. The *Περίηγησις* of Laskaris is very brief, occupying only about a page and a half, and describes a visit to the north of Europe in the beginning of the 15th century; that of Batatzis, written in the usual political doggerel and miserably rhymed, gives an account of two voyages made in the first quarter of last century, one to Russia and Persia, the other to various European countries. Neither contains anything of great interest.

In this notice we have not mentioned any of Mr. Lambros' numerous archaeological articles scattered through different periodicals, the *Ἀθήναιον*, the *Παρυασσός*, the *Mittheilungen des deutschen archæologischen Instituts in Athen*, etc. In taking leave of so profound and accurate a scholar, we can only express the wish that his valuable activity may be continued for many years, and that he may succeed in making the middle age of Hellenism as interesting as that of Latinism has long been recognized to be.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

Griechische Grammatik von GUSTAV MEYER. Leipzig. 1880. Breitkopf und Härtel (Bibliothek Indogermanischer Grammatiken, Band III.)

This book is important from the position which it must hold in the future history of Greek grammar, if for nothing else, for it is the first treatise in which the investigations recently made on Indo-European vocalism are applied to at least two important chapters of Greek grammar; and it may be regarded as an official summary of what has been done in this field up to the time of the appearance of the book. Its completeness, its trustworthiness, and above all the extent to which it affords new light, will necessarily depend upon the degree in which these researches on vocalism are themselves complete and trustworthy. Gustav Meyer is one of the most ardent devotees of these studies, and that too after having clung to older methods up to an astonishingly short time previous to the publication of his grammar. Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, vol. XXIV, 216 ff., contains an article by him entitled "Ueber den einfluss des hochtons auf den griechischen vocalismus," which is now valuable mostly because it shows how an honest scholar can change his opinions from 1879, the date of the article, to 1880, the date of the book before us.

In the article he seems to ignore completely the grand advances of the preceding four years of investigation. In the grammar he meets views resulting